

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
SECRETARY OF STATE'S OFFICE

In the Matter of: )  
 )  
 )  
Voting Modernization Board )  
Board Meeting )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

VOTING MODERNIZATION BOARD (VMB)

REMOTE VIA ZOOM

TUESDAY, MAY 10, 2022

10:00 A.M.

Reported by: Martha Nelson, CERT

## APPEARANCES

VMB BOARD MEMBERS:

Stephen Kaufman, Chair  
June Awano Lagmay  
Gabriel Sandoval

CALIFORNIA SECRETARY OF STATE STAFF PRESENT:

Joan Hackeling  
Jana Lean  
Paula Ritter  
Robbie Anderson  
NaKeshia Robinson

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Ryan Ronco, Placer County Registrar of Voters  
John Gardner, Solano County Assistant Registrar of Voters  
Austin Cliche, Office Coordinator, Solano County Registrar of Voters

## INDEX

	Page
I. Call to Order	4
II. Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum	4
III. Public Comment	4
IV. Adoption of February 9, 2022, Actions and Meeting Minutes	4
V. Project Documentation Plan Review and Funding Award Approval: Receive staff reports for approval of funding awards. A) Placer County B) Solano County	6
VI. Additional Funding Round	19
VII. Other Business	40
VIII. Adjournment	42

## P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 MAY 10, 2022

10:02 A.M.

3 CHAIR KAUFMAN: We're going to call this meeting of  
4 the Voting Modernization Board to order and ask -- Joan, are  
5 you calling roll this morning or is that Paula?

6 MS. RITTER: This is Paula.

7 MS. HACKELING: I'll let you.

8 MS. RITTER: I'll go ahead and do it.

9 MS. HACKELING: Thank you.

10 MS. RITTER: Stephen Kaufman?

11 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Here.

12 MS. RITTER: June Lagmay?

13 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Here.

14 MS. RITTER: And Gabriel Sandoval?

15 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Present.

16 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Great. We have a quorum. Thank you,  
17 everybody, for being flexible and getting this meeting  
18 rescheduled as soon as possible. So here we are on May 10th.

19 And I will ask whether there are any members of the  
20 public wishing to comment on matters that are not on the  
21 current agenda? Do we have any? Do we have any public  
22 comment?

23 Okay, seeing or hearing none, let's go to item four  
24 on the agenda, which is the adoption of the February 9, 2022,  
25 actions and meeting minutes. I think we had some comments

1 that were submitted previously, some amendments to those  
2 minutes.

3 So with the changes that were requested and either  
4 made or to be made, do we have a motion to approve the action  
5 items and meeting minutes from the February 9 meeting?

6 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: So moved.

7 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Gabriel Sanchez [sic] moves.  
8 I'm presuming --

9 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: My last name is Sandoval, not  
10 Sanchez.

11 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Sorry. I got that wrong -- my  
12 apologies.

13 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: June seconds.

14 CHAIR KAUFMAN: June seconds. All in favor? Aye.

15 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

16 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

17 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Apologies, Gabriel.

18 Next, we have item five on the agenda, which is the  
19 Project Documentation Plan Review and Funding Award  
20 Proposals. We have two submissions that we're taking up  
21 today. The first one is Placer County, so let us hear from  
22 staff about those submissions.

23 And again, we appreciate, to the extent there are any  
24 county representatives, we appreciate you all being flexible.

25 And I know that you were ready to go a couple weeks ago but

1 pleased that we could take up these issues here today.

2           So let us have the staff report on Placer County.

3           MS. HACKELING: Thank you. This is Placer County's  
4 Phase 3 Project Documentation Plan. Their project Phase 3  
5 PDP package meets the requirements for completeness, pending  
6 submission of signed vendor agreements and invoices.

7           Just as background, Placer County proposed  
8 modernizing its voting system in three phases. In 2004, in  
9 Phase 1 of its strategy, the County was reimbursed by the  
10 Board for the purchase of Global AccuVote Optical scanning  
11 units, AccuFeed Ballot Feeder units, and GEMS Software from  
12 Diebold Elections Systems, which were fully implemented for  
13 the March 2002 Primary Election.

14           Then, in 2006, the County purchased a touch screen  
15 component to meet HAVA Title III voting system  
16 requirements.

17           In Phase 2 of its voting modernization strategy, the  
18 County was reimbursed for the purchase of an Agilis vote-by-  
19 mail sorting/scanning system, a Sentio ballot printing  
20 system, and AccuVote-OS memory cards from Dominion Voting  
21 Systems. The equipment was implemented for the November  
22 2014 General Election.

23           Then, in 2020, the California Secretary of State  
24 notified all counties of its intent to withdraw certification  
25 and conditional approval of all California voting systems not

1 tested and certified to California Voting System Standards,  
2 which decertified the County's legacy equipment. The County  
3 used funds in the state budget to purchase its current voting  
4 system, the Dominion Voting Systems Democracy Suite, which  
5 meets all current state and Election Assistance Commission  
6 requirements.

7           The County also purchased an Opex Rapid Ballot  
8 Extractor with grant monies to address a bottleneck in the  
9 processing of an increasing number of vote-by-mail ballots.  
10 The County has seen an increase in the number of registered  
11 voters in recent years. In addition, an increasing  
12 percentage of voters are opting to cast their votes by mail.  
13 At the November 2012 General Election, 67 percent of voters  
14 used vote-by-mail ballots. At the 2021 Gubernatorial Recall  
15 Election, 95 percent of voters voted by mail.

16           Voters are also returning their vote by mail ballots  
17 closer to Election Day. And as a result, the County has been  
18 challenged to process an increasing number of vote-by-mail  
19 ballots in a diminishing amount of time. The County has  
20 managed by increasing work hours and hiring additional  
21 temporary staff in an already cramped space.

22           In Phase 3 of its voting modernization strategy, the  
23 County requests funds to purchase a second Model 72 Rapid  
24 Extraction Desk Envelope Extractor. Given the dramatic  
25 increases in vote by mail ballots, a second unit is required



1 for two very important reasons. The first is redundancy.  
2 The backup is of primary importance should the Opex Extractor  
3 stop working for even a small period of time. The second  
4 reason is that another unit would allow them to run  
5 the ballots coming off of the Agilis units on separate  
6 machines and allow for a greater throughput of ballot  
7 envelopes in a shorter window of time.

8           The County also requests funds to purchase a  
9 PowerVault NX3240 Storage Server. The storage appliance will  
10 be used to store election database and image backups. This  
11 appliance will act as a central repository for past  
12 election backups. These backups will include the entire  
13 election database and all ballot images.

14           Due to the increased storage requirements associated  
15 with the Dominion RTR, or Results to Report system,  
16 significantly increasing the storage capacity is essential to  
17 the long term storage of past and future election database  
18 backups.

19           The County's estimated purchase date for these items  
20 is Fall 2022. Training and implementation are planned in  
21 order to allow for full functionality by March/April of 2023.  
22 Total project costs are \$47,052.25. The County requests  
23 funds from the Voting Modernization Board in the amount of  
24 \$35,289.19. The County will provide matching funds in the  
25 amount of \$11,763.06.

1           It is our recommendation that Placer County's Phase 3  
2 Project Documentation Plan be conditionally approved pending  
3 signed vendor agreements, and a Conditional Funding Award  
4 Letter be issued in the amount of \$35,289.19. Vendor quotes  
5 were provided for the requested items. The funds would be  
6 released upon the County's submission of signed vendor  
7 agreements and invoices.

8           Thank you.

9           BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Thank you.

10          CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you, Joan. I have just one  
11 question on this, so I think we did this in our last round,  
12 too, so because they haven't yet actually purchased the  
13 equipment, this would be a conditional funding award letter;  
14 correct?

15          MS. HACKELING: Yes.

16          CHAIR KAUFMAN: With the information to be provided,  
17 essentially, after the fact?

18          MS. HACKELING: Correct.

19          CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Did any other members of the  
20 Board have questions of staff before I ask for comment from  
21 Placer County?

22          BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: No questions.

23          BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: No questions.

24          CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Then do we have a  
25 representative of Placer County that wishes to speak this

1 morning?

2 MR. RONCO: Hi. Yes. This is Ryan Ronco, Placer  
3 County Clerk Recorder, Registrar of Voters. I don't wish to  
4 speak, but I'm happy to speak. And, really, I have nothing  
5 prepared in advance of your discussion, I  
6 just -- we have appreciated the work that the VMB has done to  
7 this point trying to help us be able to prepare this  
8 documentation for you. It has actually been a challenge for  
9 us and we appreciate what Joan has been able to put together,  
10 giving us guidance along the way but I think it's a fairly  
11 easy package.

12 I think that the only hurdle that we know that we  
13 recognize is that we haven't purchased this equipment yet, so  
14 conditional approval would be very much appreciated in this  
15 instance. We are working with our county to, hopefully, move  
16 the purchase up a lot sooner, actually in this fiscal year  
17 rather than next fiscal year, due to some salary savings that  
18 we've been able to recognize this year. So hopefully we'll  
19 have some documentation to you actually earlier than the fall  
20 of this year.

21 But other than that, if you have questions of us,  
22 we're here to answer those.

23 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you for that. And we are  
24 pleased that you were able to get another submission together  
25 here before the end of the line, so thank you for getting

1 that done. And I found it remarkable in the staff report to  
2 read that you all were at 95 percent mail-in balloting for  
3 the Gubernatorial Recall Election.

4 MR. RONCO: Yeah. It's -- we were at 82 percent  
5 permanent vote-by-mail before the change in the law. But I  
6 think that these last two election cycles, the November 2020  
7 Presidential and the Gubernatorial Recall in 2021, allowed  
8 some more voters who had been resistant to vote-by-mail to  
9 see that the process works and it's safe and it's secure.

10 So I do think that it will be interesting to see what  
11 happens this election but certainly it's necessary for us to  
12 be able to increase in capacity there. Our big chokepoint  
13 was probably opening the envelopes. And one Opex is great  
14 and has been helpful but it goes down a little bit. And it,  
15 also, would be nice for us to be able to even have two going  
16 at the same time, so this is good.

17 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Well, thank you.

18 June or Gabriel, do you have any questions for Mr.  
19 Ronco?

20 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: No, it's very  
21 straightforward. Thank you.

22 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: No questions. Thank you.

23 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Then with that, do we have a  
24 motion to approve Placer County's Project Documentation Plan  
25 and award them the amount recommended in the staff report?

1 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I'll make the motion. I  
2 move that we, the Board, adopt staff recommendations  
3 regarding Placer County's Phase 3 funding in the amount of  
4 \$35,289.19, conditioned upon submission of the signed vendor  
5 agreements.

6 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Do we have a second?

7 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Second.

8 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Great. Why don't we just call the  
9 roll so that it's clear on the record for this?

10 MS. RITTER: Stephen Kaufman?

11 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

12 MS. RITTER: June Awano Lagmay?

13 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

14 MS. RITTER: And Gabriel Sandoval?

15 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

16 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Great. Thank you all. And we will  
17 look forward to getting that approval letter out to you, Mr.  
18 Ronco. Thank you for appearing this morning.

19 MR. RONCO: Thank you so much. Appreciate it.  
20 Please give John Gardner from Solano County a harder time  
21 than you gave me because he's

22 CHAIR KAUFMAN: We're not trying --

23 MR. RONCO: -- (indiscernible).

24 CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- we're not trying to make it  
25 difficult, folks.

1 MR. RONCO: All right. Oh, well, I'm just kidding.  
2 Thank you so much, really important. We appreciate your  
3 efforts and thank you so much for this.

4 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Well, thank you. Thanks for all your  
5 hard work.

6 All right, let us move on to Solano and we can put  
7 Mr. Gardner in the hotseat.

8 MS. HACKELING: Okay. I will also be presenting the  
9 Solano County staff report.

10 The Solano County Phase 3 Project Documentation Plan  
11 meets the requirements for completeness.

12 Again, as background, in 2005, in Phase 1 of its  
13 voting modernization strategy, the County was reimbursed by  
14 the Board for Elections Systems and Software optical scan  
15 ballot counter hardware and UNITY software.

16 In 2006, in Phase 2, the County was reimbursed for  
17 ES&S AutoMark Voter Assist Terminals, additional ballot  
18 scanners, a ballot on-demand printer, and UNITY software.

19 In 2015, the County modernized its Vote by Mail, or  
20 VBM, processing equipment with the purchase of a Bell &  
21 Howell sorter with non-VBM funds. This equipment scans all  
22 incoming VBM ballots.

23 The County has seen continued growth in the use of  
24 VBM. In the 2016 General Election, 46 percent of County  
25 voters voted in person at polling places. For the 2020

1 General Election, 11 percent of the County's  
2 voters voted in person. For the Gubernatorial Recall  
3 Election, that number fell to 10 percent.

4 For Phase 3 of its voting modernization strategy, in  
5 order to handle the increasing volume of VBM ballots  
6 efficiently, the County is requesting reimbursement funds for  
7 the purchase of enhancements to its Fluence, formerly B&H,  
8 Elevate VBM sorter. The new hardware and software will allow  
9 for the implementation of future security improvements and to  
10 utilize higher speed connections. The new imaging hardware  
11 augments the tab detection cameras and lasers, which drive  
12 critical VBM sorting functions and image processing.  
13 The County has not received prior funding related to the  
14 items requested in this PDP.

15 The County has provided signed vendor contracts for  
16 the items requested.

17 It is our recommendation that Solano County's Phase 3  
18 Project Documentation Plan be approved, and a Funding Award  
19 Letter be issued in the amount of \$72,871.50.

20 Thank you.

21 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Thank you.

22 Commissioners, do you have any questions of staff  
23 regarding their recommendation?

24 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: No questions.

25 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: No questions.

1           CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Then with that, we'll put Mr.  
2 Gardner in the hotseat and allow him to make any comments, if  
3 you wish, in support of your funding request. I don't know,  
4 your request is about twice as much as Placer County's, so I  
5 don't know, you'll have to try twice as hard, I guess, but it  
6 seems fairly straightforward. But if there's anything you'd  
7 like to say in support of the request, you can have the  
8 floor.

9           MR. GARDNER: Sure. Well, thank you. I'm John  
10 Gardner. I'm the Assistant Registrar of Voters. Thank you,  
11 Mr. Chair, members of the Board. Thank you to Joan for all  
12 of her help in this.

13           Also here is Tim Flanagan. He is -- (clears throat)  
14 excuse me -- he is our Registrar of Voters for Solano County.  
15 And I have Austin Cliche. And Austin is the subject matter  
16 expert that really put all of this together for us.

17           But with our increase in vote-by-mail and the  
18 importance of really documenting what we do with our vote-by-  
19 mail incoming envelopes has been really important over the  
20 years and that continues to grow. So updating the system to  
21 modern technology, getting off of a Windows XP platform,  
22 moving to modern Windows 10, advanced cameras that have a  
23 higher, clearer picture of the envelopes when we need to  
24 document which voter sent what, as well as capturing the  
25 signatures for our election management system just becomes



1 increasingly important to the operation, both during the  
2 election and after the election.

3           If we're doing research to prove different things  
4 that happened, we want to be able to go back to those  
5 electronic images, the full image of the ballot, rather than  
6 have to try to search through archived boxes. So that speeds  
7 us up kind of in auditing our processes, as well as just the  
8 day-to-day processing. But certainly the updates are -- will  
9 be very helpful to our operation.

10           Austin, did you want to add anything to that?

11           MR. CLICHE: No. Thank you very much for letting us  
12 take the floor and for hearing our presentation today,  
13 everyone.

14           As John went ahead and said, with the increase that  
15 we're going ahead and seeing in vote-by-mail, similar to  
16 Placer, not quite to their level of return just yet, but in  
17 2020, we were up to about ten percent only of our registered  
18 voters turning out to polling locations. So with the  
19 increases that we're seeing with vote-by-mail, these augments  
20 will go ahead and assist us in keeping up with that process,  
21 making sure that we have what we need for our backups, and  
22 making sure that we're going through everything in a very  
23 thorough and rapid approach so that we can go ahead and keep  
24 up.

25           Thank you.

1           CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you. I had just a question on  
2 what you said. How extensive are the polling places you are  
3 going to be providing for the June and November elections  
4 given the patterns? Are you on a vote center model or are  
5 you still doing individual polling places? I realize your  
6 population center isn't as huge as some of the other  
7 jurisdictions that we deal with. So how is that working on a  
8 going-forward basis?

9           MR. GARDNER: Well, we are still doing traditional  
10 polling place elections, so we have roughly 70 locations  
11 around the county. And we have kind of reduced some of  
12 those. And a lot of these polling places were located across  
13 the street from other locations, so we were able to, kind of  
14 cut that back down to one without greatly impacting voters  
15 that still wanted to vote in person, even though it's only  
16 about ten percent of the total turnout. But we also had some  
17 places that were barely seeing 100 voters all day long, so  
18 you have a lot of energy and resources sent out there to  
19 service barely 100 people casting ballots.

20           We are, though, seeing an increase in the number of  
21 people who are returning ballots on election day. So instead  
22 of taking advantage of the post office, we have increased the  
23 number of drop-off locations around the county for both 30  
24 days and for the last five days before an election, kind of  
25 affording people a little easier access to just drop off that

1 ballot and return it to us versus showing up to vote in-  
2 person on election day. That's typically our experience.

3 CHAIR KAUFMAN: And those are at separate locations  
4 from the polling places?

5 MR. GARDNER: Correct. Yeah. We have 16, I believe,  
6 is our number of drop-off locations, plus the 70 polling  
7 places. And, of course, you would drop a ballot off at a  
8 polling place. We're prepared for that, as well.

9 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Great. Thank you.

10 June, do you have any questions for Solano County?

11 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: No, I do not.

12 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Gabriel?

13 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: I don't have any questions.

14 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Then, again, why don't we --  
15 if somebody wants to make a motion to approve the staff  
16 recommendation for Solano County, that would be great.

17 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: I move that the Board adopts  
18 the recommendation from the staff that Solano County's Phase  
19 3 Project Documentation Plan be approved and that a funding  
20 award letter be issued in the amount of \$72,871.50.

21 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I second that motion.

22 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Great. Paula, do you want to take  
23 roll on the vote?

24 MS. RITTER: Sure. Stephen Kaufman?

25 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

1 MS. RITTER: June Awano Lagmay?

2 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

3 MS. RITTER: And Gabriel Sandoval?

4 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

5 CHAIR KAUFMAN: There you go, Solano County.

6 Congratulations. Use the money well. And we look forward to  
7 hearing good things from your elections this, well, I guess  
8 this summer and this fall.

9 MR. GARDNER: Thank you.

10 MR. CLICHE: Thank you.

11 CHAIR KAUFMAN: All right. Now let's go to item six,  
12 which is a discussion about additional funding rounds. I'll  
13 note that for both of the counties that we just took up, each  
14 of them is leaving some money on the table, as have other  
15 counties. And so we do have additional funding that's still  
16 sitting in the kitty.

17 We appreciate that a number of counties responded to  
18 and stepped forward in response to the staff notifications  
19 about closing the books on this last round of funding. And  
20 now we need to figure out what to do going forward. And now  
21 the staff has prepared a series of recommendations for us on  
22 that, so why don't we hear the staff recommendations? And  
23 then we can discuss how to proceed with this issue.

24 MS. RITTER: Thank you. This is Paula and I'll be  
25 presenting the report on this.

1           So the Board just awarded Placer and Solano County's  
2 monies for the final funding round. And the final round of  
3 funding was based on amounts that were initially allocated  
4 back in 2002. And so now that those awards have been made,  
5 there's a remainder of \$11.6-roughly million remaining in the  
6 fund. And at the last Board meeting on February 9th, the  
7 Board offered an additional funding round. And that opened  
8 up that \$11.6 million to all the counties to come forward and  
9 submit an additional application to receive some of that  
10 funding.

11           And we received five applications -- or applications  
12 from five counties, totaling \$4.2 million. And as we  
13 reviewed them, we realized that some of the pieces of  
14 equipment that they requested funding for were not allowable.  
15 And so our recommended allotment for the additional funding  
16 round is roughly \$2.8 million, in round numbers, \$800,000 to  
17 Los Angeles, \$2,000 to Mono, \$400,000 to San Joaquin, and  
18 \$1.5 million to Santa Clara.

19           Some of the counties that submitted applications were  
20 not able to provide their board resolutions by the April 6th  
21 deadline for applications. And so we are recommending that  
22 the VMB grant an extension of time until May 25th of 2022 for  
23 the counties to submit their resolutions.

24           And with that being said, if those allotments are  
25 awarded, then the remaining funds will be \$8.8 million.

1 That's unallocated funds remaining in the Voting  
2 Modernization Fund.

3 So we considered some options for the Board as to how  
4 we could dispose of those remaining funds and I will go over  
5 them now.

6 The first option is to authorize another funding  
7 round. And because there are other funding options available  
8 to the counties that don't have the same kind of restrictions  
9 as Prop 41 funds, and they don't require the same level of  
10 documentation, there actually appears to be a lack of  
11 interest in the counties for submitting applications to the  
12 VMB. So if the Board were to approve this option, we would  
13 recommend surveying the counties to gauge the level of  
14 interest and participation that we can expect and to decide  
15 what a workable timeframe would be prior to authorizing  
16 another round.

17 If the Board wanted to go with this option, we could  
18 survey the counties in July and present the results of that  
19 survey at the August 24th Board meeting.

20 The second option we looked at was to extend the  
21 deadline for the additional funding round. The applications  
22 that we're looking at now from the five counties are for the  
23 additional funding round and those were due on April 6th.  
24 And we have received communications of interest from Fresno,  
25 Placer, and Ventura in submitting applications if we were

1 able to extend the deadline. And, also, San Joaquin  
2 expressed an interest in amending their application to  
3 include some additional equipment.

4 So if the Board were to approve this option, we would  
5 recommend the following timeline, and I've got it up here on  
6 the screen for you. So the middle column on the table  
7 lists the existing dates for the meetings and deadlines.

8 And the right column would be what we're proposing  
9 for an extension. So the application submission deadline  
10 would be extended to July 6. And then those applications  
11 could be reviewed at the August 24th Board meeting. And the  
12 PDPs could be submitted by the September 21st meeting. That  
13 would actually push the payment request deadline out until  
14 March of 2023. I think with the original timeline we were  
15 trying to wrap it up by the end of this year, so that would  
16 push it out a little farther. I mean, obviously, these dates  
17 are all up for change or whatever the Board wants to do with  
18 regard to the dates.

19 We also wouldn't want to penalize the counties that  
20 did submit their applications on time. So we would recommend  
21 that, for the counties who submitted applications for  
22 allowable equipment, that we go ahead and approve those now.  
23 And then any future applications that would be received under  
24 this option would share in the remaining unallocated funds of  
25 \$8.8 million.

1           The third option that we looked at was closing the  
2 fund because these funds have been available since 2002, so  
3 for 20 years, and the request for applications for the  
4 additional funding round didn't generate enough interest to  
5 use up all the money that is remaining. And, again, because  
6 of the aforementioned lack of interest from the counties,  
7 there are other funds that are easier to get, it seems fairly  
8 unlikely that there would be any significant request for VMB  
9 funding in the future.

10           If the Board were to consider this option, we would  
11 need to do some additional research and determine exactly how  
12 that would be accomplished. And we're proposing that staff  
13 could provide the results of that research at the August 24th  
14 Board meeting.

15           So those were the three options we considered. There  
16 are probably others but those are the ones that seemed  
17 likely.

18           CHAIR KAUFMAN: May I ask you, just so I'm clear,  
19 we've got -- so we've got those that submitted and you guys  
20 have done the review and there's about \$2.8 million that can  
21 be approved based on what's in the door, so to speak. And  
22 then I'm trying to match up these things. So then there's  
23 this additional group, you mentioned at the beginning of the  
24 memo and then we kind of come back to it, and so there are  
25 five, just so I'm clear, there's five counties that actually



1 submitted requests but they didn't have completed  
2 applications, so that totals -- I'm sorry.

3           What's the amount that's on the table that could be  
4 on the table for additional funding for counties that  
5 expressed an interest but couldn't get their Project  
6 Documentation Plans in order in time for this meeting or by  
7 the deadline that we're being asked to extend for?

8           MS. RITTER: We don't have amounts for those.

9           CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay.

10          MS. LEAN: And the reason we don't -- sorry, this is  
11 Jana Lean. The reason we don't is because they haven't  
12 submitted their whole package, so we haven't reviewed it to  
13 see what's acceptable and what we'd recommend for funding, so  
14 that's the reason why we don't have amounts set right now.

15          CHAIR KAUFMAN: So there's about \$8.8 million that's  
16 left. Can we safely assume that those counties that have  
17 expressed an interest but haven't submitted, even if they got  
18 the maximum amount potentially available, I don't know, would  
19 they -- they would be within the \$8.8 million?

20          MS. LEAN: Yes, sir. That's our estimate right now.  
21 None of them have submitted anything or any kind of interest  
22 that would amount to that amount of money

23          CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah.

24          MS. LEAN: -- at this point.

25          CHAIR KAUFMAN: So it's fairly safe to say that if we

1 extended the deadlines for them, we wouldn't have to worry  
2 about whether we're needing to kind of allocate, come up with  
3 some allocation formula, if we decided that we would kind of  
4 go with and allow for the submission by all counties that  
5 have expressed -- that have already expressed and interest  
6 and that have either submitted or said that they would  
7 submit?

8 MS. LEAN: Based on the conversations that the staff  
9 has had, no, I don't believe that would be an issue.

10 I do believe, with the extension, we may still have  
11 folks come forward. We may still have some money that would  
12 be remaining, so we are continuing to do research on what  
13 that means in the future, assuming that we have exhausted as  
14 much as we can with the counties, being able to submit plans  
15 for allowable expenses and what that would mean. So we're  
16 still in the process of doing that additional research right  
17 now.

18 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Yeah, I'm just a little -- I  
19 mean, I'll just throw it out to my fellow Board members. I  
20 don't -- I guess I'm not adverse. I don't have a problem  
21 with extending the deadline for those that have already shown  
22 a desire to submit and have responded to the -- to our  
23 outreach and giving them a small extension of time to submit.  
24 But then I'm worried about kind of we're continuing to just  
25 chase after that, just continuing to like chase down people

1 to try and use up whatever's left, and there's not even an  
2 apparent interest in trying to get those funds.

3 So I don't know, I'll throw it open for discussion to  
4 my fellow Commissioners.

5 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: So this is June. I am  
6 leaning with Stephen in allowing the small extension to May  
7 25th for those counties that didn't get their resolution in  
8 time. That I would not have a problem with doing.

9 But I do have just a very quick point of information  
10 to ask of staff.

11 Of the five that applied and the four that qualified  
12 for funding, that is L.A., Mono, San Joaquin, and Santa  
13 Clara, which of those did not yet provide their resolution  
14 for which we are going to allow the extension to May 25th?

15 MS. RITTER: Unfortunately, I don't remember off the  
16 top of my head. I know Los Angeles needs to turn theirs in.

17 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Okay.

18 MS. RITTER: And San Joaquin.

19 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Thank you. Even if  
20 that's just a rough guess, that's helpful.

21 So as best as you can recall, two of the four still  
22 have to get their resolution in by May 25th?

23 MS. RITTER: Correct. It might be three. It might  
24 be --

25 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: It might be three?

1 MS. RITTER: -- Santa Clara, as well, I'm not sure.

2 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Oh, okay. All right.

3 CHAIR KAUFMAN: I mean, if May 25th, which is coming  
4 up closely, is going to be an obstacle, we can certainly talk  
5 about moving that date a little. But at least there we're  
6 providing an extension for folks who have already shown a  
7 desire and have already presented information to support  
8 additional requests.

9 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: How was the May 25th date  
10 selected?

11 MS. RITTER: It was basically an extension of a  
12 little over a month. And it fit within the guidelines of the  
13 existing timeline so that if we -- it wouldn't prevent us  
14 from approving their PDPs at the June meeting.

15 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: So it kind of kept it on  
16 a time track --

17 MS. RITTER: Correct.

18 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: -- on the existing time  
19 track?

20 MS. RITTER: Yeah. That was the submission date on  
21 the existing track for the PDP submission, so it would allow  
22 them to submit their PDPs and their Board resolutions at the  
23 same time.

24 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Not knowing whether they  
25 would have a Board meeting to approve those resolutions on

1 their end?

2 MS. RITTER: For the most part, most of the counties  
3 wouldn't have a problem submitting it by May 25th.

4 MS. LEAN: I would suggest -- this is Jana. I would  
5 suggest moving it out at least a month or maybe a little bit  
6 more than a month if possible if you guys would consider  
7 that, only because they definitely will have to go to their  
8 board in order to certify the results of their election in  
9 July, so we know for sure they can get on the Board's agenda  
10 for that. It's just a suggestion.

11 And I can tell you that our staff, and staff is  
12 amazing, but we are now 28 days away from the election and  
13 counties are absolutely going full bore to prepare for the  
14 election. We're already in vote-by-mail voting right now,  
15 drop boxes opened today, so I know folks are quite busy.  
16 They will be busy this entire year, yes, but that might be  
17 something that you may want to consider because they have to  
18 submit stuff, our staff will need to take time to review it  
19 and make sure that these are allowable expenses, and then  
20 prepare the Project Documentation staff report, so it's just  
21 a thought.

22 I've just been thinking about the counties and our  
23 staff and your time. And I know that you guys are very busy  
24 folks and you're doing this out of the kindness of your  
25 heart, and you have for very many years and it's very much

1 appreciated, in order to disburse this, I still think much  
2 needed funding mechanism for counties to have.

3 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah. I mean, I'm not interested in  
4 extending a deadline that makes it impossible for them to  
5 meet, so I don't think anybody is. But I'm also -- for the  
6 same reasons you just stated, if we then kind of create new  
7 rounds and new deadlines that are all going to be in the  
8 middle of an election year, that's going to become equally  
9 unrealistic for them to be able to start, I think, preparing  
10 new submissions and doing whatever they need to do in the  
11 middle of another election cycle, so --

12 MS. LEAN: I would agree, sir. The one thing is, I  
13 can tell you right now, they're also in the process of --  
14 there's a lot of initiative petitions that are being turned  
15 in right now and so they're doing signature verification, on  
16 top of running the election. So I know that, Mr. Kaufman,  
17 you are quite aware of a lot of that, and so are other folks,  
18 but we are in heavy initiative time right now. And it will -  
19 - of course, the deadline is in June -- for those to be  
20 approved to be on the ballots. But the signature  
21 verification is going on right now for, I believe, six  
22 initiatives and actively right now.

23 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: May I make a suggestion?  
24 Why don't we take the recommendations of staff's report on  
25 page four in bites, if we could vote on -- discuss and vote

1 on recommendations one and two first and get those out of the  
2 way? Because those are what's in front of us now as opposed  
3 to anything in the future, maybe we could approach it that  
4 way, in smaller bites?

5 CHAIR KAUFMAN: I agree. I think that's a good  
6 recommendation, so, all right, so let's get, let's get those  
7 out of the way.

8 So I think we've -- so does somebody -- want to make  
9 a motion on item number one with respect to the approval --  
10 of the amounts that have been already submitted?

11 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I'll move that the staff  
12 recommendation on approving the allotment of \$2.779 million  
13 for the additional funding round, as described in the staff  
14 report dated May 10th, be approved.

15 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Do I have a second?

16 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Just for clarification, it's  
17 \$2,779,343.97. I think, June, you had inadvertently said  
18 \$279 million, so just to be clear.

19 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Wow, not enough coffee.  
20 Thank you, Gabriel.

21 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: You're welcome.

22 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Thank you.

23 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: As amended.

24 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Very important.

25 CHAIR KAUFMAN: As amended, you second?

1 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Second.

2 CHAIR KAUFMAN: And I just want to be clear on this  
3 before we vote. So we are voting that the amount is allotted  
4 but we are still going to -- we are still going to have those  
5 Project Documentation Plans presented to us for approval at  
6 the subsequent -- at the June meeting as its currently  
7 calendared; correct?

8 MS. RITTER: That is correct.

9 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay.

10 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: It's just putting it  
11 aside?

12 MS. RITTER: Correct.

13 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. So let's take a vote on that.

14 MS. RITTER: Stephen Kaufman?

15 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

16 MS. RITTER: June Awano Lagmay?

17 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

18 MS. RITTER: Gabriel Sandoval?

19 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

20 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Now, as I understand this  
21 decision point, some of the counties that make up that  
22 allotment that we just approved need an extension of time to  
23 be able to submit their -- basically, to complete their  
24 applications to get documentation from the counties to  
25 support their requests, which make up that \$2.779 million



1 allocation; is that correct?

2 MS. RITTER: That's correct.

3 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. And so what is the staff  
4 recommendation then if we want to provide the counties more  
5 time, given current circumstances, than the May 25th date.  
6 What is the date that you are recommending that we use that  
7 would be appropriate in light of everything that the counties  
8 are working on and having to do between now and the  
9 certification of the election results?

10 MS. RITTER: Jana, did you have a suggested date in  
11 July?

12 MS. LEAN: I do have suggested dates. So the  
13 certification for the election is July 7th. I would suggest  
14 you would do it at the end of the following week, July 15th.

15 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. So do we have a motion to  
16 approve an extension of time until June -- July, I'm sorry,  
17 did you say 15th?

18 MS. LEAN: Yes, sir.

19 CHAIR KAUFMAN: July 15th for the counties to  
20 complete their applications?

21 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Well, I'll move that the  
22 staff recommendation to approve an extension of time -- well,  
23 actually, it's the staff recommendation as amended by the  
24 Board with staff's concurrence to make the extension of time  
25 until July 15th for counties that did submit applications by

1 the deadline but have not yet submitted their governing board  
2 resolutions be approved.

3 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Second.

4 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. And again, before we vote on  
5 that, just for clarification, does it make sense then, and  
6 I'm asking this of staff, since there are some that are  
7 completed, some that aren't, and they're all going to be in  
8 a -- be under the umbrella of this additional funding round,  
9 does it make sense that the next meeting should be to approve  
10 all of these at once, in other words, rather than do a June  
11 meeting where two or three of these counties are approved and  
12 then a subsequent meeting where the others are approved or  
13 does that matter?

14 MS. LEAN: I would recommend that but I did not ask  
15 of staff, so sorry.

16 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Well, I think it probably  
17 makes sense. We can, I guess, we can deal with that from a  
18 timing and scheduling standpoint at the end of this meeting,  
19 but all right.

20 Well, we have a motion on the table, and we have a  
21 second, so why don't we take a vote on that?

22 MS. RITTER: Stephen Kaufman?

23 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

24 MS. RITTER: June Awano Lagmay?

25 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

1 MS. RITTER: And Gabriel Sandoval?

2 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

3 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay, so now we've taken care of  
4 money that's been allocated in the second phase.

5 So now the question is, basically: Should there be  
6 another phase or do we extend the deadline that we just kind  
7 of talked about in the context of counties that have applied  
8 and some who have applied but haven't completed their  
9 applications? (Sneezes.) Excuse me.

10 You know, I guess, again, in the theme of the goal  
11 has always been to get the money distributed and help the  
12 counties, it seems like there have been requests from, or at  
13 least indications from, a couple of counties that may have an  
14 interest in submitting yet again, but I don't know how much  
15 longer we keep extending deadlines and chasing counties until  
16 the well is totally dry to the penny.

17 So I guess I'll ask my fellow Commissioners if  
18 there's a will or desire to consider extending deadlines or  
19 maybe just creating yet a third round of funding instead  
20 of -- I guess it would be creating a third round of funding?

21 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I'm of a like mind with  
22 the Chair that, for a period of 20 years, we're re-chopping  
23 the same trees. And staff has been exemplary in reaching out  
24 to counties for all the different funding rounds that have  
25 happened up to now, predating even my participation on this

1 Board.

2           So being that we have not been absolutely swarmed  
3 with interest in future rounds of funding, I am leaning  
4 toward closing the fund and allowing staff until August 24th  
5 to come up with recommendations on exact steps how to do  
6 that. But I would be interested in knowing how the other  
7 members feel, as well.

8           BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: I'm in agreement. It seems  
9 that, with the staff's guidance and assistance that, as June  
10 mentioned, has been exemplary, the counties have been the  
11 recipients of multiple opportunities to access this funding  
12 to address concerns related to voting and increased access,  
13 et cetera, over the years. And we are looking at a response  
14 that is not going to be indicative of the complete use of  
15 these funds based on the information we have.

16           So I think in reality we're going to be in a position  
17 where there are going to be funds, perhaps in the millions of  
18 dollars, left over. And so I agree with June and with  
19 Stephen that we should really look to see, what are the  
20 options to close out this particular funding pool in a way  
21 that makes sense and a way that, obviously, that is legal, so  
22 I would make that recommendation, as well.

23           CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah, I'm hearing, I think, a  
24 consensus. I don't think we're ever going to get this thing  
25 down to zero. And it seems like the counties have had and

1 continue to have other sources of funding that have satisfied  
2 their needs and, perhaps, have been less difficult for them  
3 to navigate in recent years than coming before our Board with  
4 the kind of limitations and restrictions that are built into  
5 the process. So, unless we hear otherwise from staff, it  
6 seems like we're not leaving any counties high and dry, even  
7 if we leave some money on the table.

8           So before we make a motion on this, are there any  
9 other -- is there any other input that staff wishes to  
10 provide on this issue?

11           Okay, then hearing none, do one of you want to make a  
12 motion, a motion with respect to moving towards closing the  
13 fund after the most recently approved allocation of funding  
14 is awarded?

15           BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Gabriel?

16           BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Sure. I'd like to move that  
17 the Board approve a motion requesting that the Secretary of  
18 State staff dealing with matters dealing with these funds  
19 provide some research and guidance and that the staff will be  
20 provided until August 24, 2022, to provide some  
21 recommendations as to the appropriate and recommended course  
22 of action to take with regard to these funds.

23           BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: May I make a friendly  
24 amendment that we be very clear that the recommendation 3-C  
25 as written recommends that the Board vote to close the fund

1 and, in addition, have staff report back on August 24th on  
2 how to conduct this be adopted so that it's clear that the  
3 action we're taking today is actually closing the fund, and  
4 then waiting for the staff to advise us how best to implement  
5 that?

6 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Yes, with that friendly  
7 amendment.

8 CHAIR KAUFMAN: And can the person recording this  
9 clearly decipher that motion? It's essentially a motion to  
10 adopt the language in the summary report provided by the  
11 staff at 3-C.

12 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Precisely.

13 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Correct? Okay. Okay, so we have a  
14 motion, we have a second. Let's take a vote on that.

15 MS. RITTER: Stephen Kaufman?

16 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

17 MS. RITTER: June Awano Lagmay?

18 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

19 MS. RITTER: Gabriel Sandoval?

20 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

21 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay, so --

22 MS. RITTER: May I ask --

23 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Sorry.

24 MS. RITTER: I'm sorry. May I ask a question?

25 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Sure.

1 MS. RITTER: We've agreed to extend the deadline for  
2 counties to submit their governing board resolutions to July  
3 15th, and so I think we need to then extend the deadlines for  
4 their PDP submission and review. I think you were talking  
5 about that earlier, so I just wanted to make sure that I  
6 understand what those new dates are.

7 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Okay.

8 MS. RITTER: So the existing PDP submission deadline  
9 was May 25th. So are we suggesting that we extend that to  
10 July 15th?

11 CHAIR KAUFMAN: I think so, yes.

12 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Yes.

13 MS. RITTER: Okay. And in that case, then, we would  
14 review those at the August 24th Board meeting?

15 CHAIR KAUFMAN: That makes sense.

16 MS. RITTER: Okay. So in that case, we no longer  
17 need to have the June Board meeting?

18 CHAIR KAUFMAN: I don't think so. I don't think  
19 there's any business we need to conduct. Unless there's any  
20 urgency for the ones that have been submitted that are ready  
21 to go, I would think we should just take them all up together  
22 as a collective additional funding round on August -- in  
23 August.

24 Jana --

25 MS. RITTER: Thank you.

1 CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- is there any reason why we  
2 wouldn't want to proceed that way?

3 MS. LEAN: No, sir. I think that's a good idea.

4 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I'm fine with that.

5 MS. RITTER: Thank you for confirming. Do we need to  
6 take a vote on that?

7 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Did we adopt those dates in a motion?  
8 I think we did.

9 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: No.

10 CHAIR KAUFMAN: No?

11 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: This is, I think,  
12 administrative business. I don't think it requires Board  
13 approval.

14 And to answer your questions, Stephen, no, we didn't.

15 MS. LEAN: So July 15th, I believe that is in the  
16 motion --

17 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah.

18 MS. LEAN: -- those funded to July 15th. But all of  
19 these internal logistical deadlines, no, I think we can deal  
20 with that, Paula, and we'll just --

21 MS. RITTER: Okay.

22 MS. LEAN: -- like make sure that it's out there for  
23 folks to understand. And I'll make sure to keep the Board  
24 members informed on what's going on.

25 MS. RITTER: Thank you for that clarification.



1 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Great. Thank you all for  
2 working through that.

3 Do we have any other business to discuss?

4 MS. LEAN: I want to give some historical feedback  
5 and just so folks know that June 6th was the very first  
6 meeting. June 6th of 2002 was the first Voting Modernization  
7 Board meeting.

8 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Oh, my gosh. That's not  
9 historical, that's hysterical.

10 MS. LEAN: And I know I was present because I was  
11 Staff Consultant to the Board back then. And I know Stephen  
12 Kaufman, you were here, I believe --

13 CHAIR KAUFMAN: I think I was --

14 MS. LEAN: -- in 2002.

15 CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- I think I was not there for the  
16 first -- I don't know. I joined a little after the initial  
17 Board meetings.

18 MS. LEAN: Okay. Well, I know I've worked with you  
19 now for --

20 CHAIR KAUFMAN: But suffice it to say, I've been  
21 around long enough.

22 MS. LEAN: It's a worthy effort --

23 CHAIR KAUFMAN: (Indiscernible.)

24 MS. LEAN: -- 20 years, so that's a long time. This  
25 has been an amazing, amazing project. And it's always great

1 to so many staff to learn about it. And I get asked  
2 questions and I'm like, oh gosh, let me think back because  
3 that's a long time ago.

4 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Thank you, Jana.

5 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Well, we've done good work. The  
6 intentions were good. The execution has been good. We've  
7 had a few ups and downs and circumstances that changed  
8 dramatically since that initial meeting. But I'm pleased to  
9 see that we've done our best throughout to give this money  
10 away and help the counties move in the right direction. And  
11 I think there's a reason why California is a model for the  
12 rest of the country in terms of how elections are run. And  
13 I'd like to think that we've played some small part in making  
14 that happen.

15 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Here-here.

16 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Well, thank you for that historic and  
17 hysteric perspective, Jana.

18 And with that, we're going to -- I am going to take a  
19 motion to adjourn this meeting.

20 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: So moved.

21 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I move for adjournment of  
22 the meeting.

23 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Second.

24 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Gabriel seconds. All in favor, say  
25 aye? Aye.

1 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

2 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

3 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Our meeting is adjourned.

4 (Thereupon, the hearing was adjourned at 10:59 a.m.)

5 --oOo--

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20